

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 2, 2007. Claims 1-14 are presented for examination, with Claims 1, 6, and 12 being in independent form. Claims 1 and 6 have been amended. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Although it is not conceded that the rejection is correct or valid, Claims 1 and 2 have been amended in an effort to expedite the allowance of this application, with special attention to the points raised in section 3 of the Office Action. It is believed that the rejection under Section 101 has been obviated, and its withdrawal is therefore respectfully requested.

The Office Action states that Claims 1 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by "Agent Offers One-Stop TV Production", Bill Carter, March 11, 2002, New York times, Late Edition ("Carter"); that Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Carter* in view of "Two Thumbs Up for Card Placement", author unknown, Credit Card Management, May 1993 ("Card Placement"); and that Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Carter* in view of Open Small Business Network ("Open"). Applicants submit that independent Claim 1, together with the claims dependent therefrom, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

Important features of Claim 1, include "a processing entity configured to evaluate the storyline and determine a solution to an issue related to said business operation, wherein said solution includes incorporating a product into said storyline such

that a nexus exists between said business operation and said product, said product configured to facilitate at least in part a resolution of said issue, wherein said storyline demonstrates said product in a context of said business operation; and an interface configured to accept input related to said solution from another owner of another business operation.” By virtue of these features, a show becomes more educational because the business owner can address key business questions using input from other business owners. Thus, when juxtaposing the business owner’s experiences with other business owners, interesting and/or helpful lessons are discovered. Moreover, products can be incorporated during certain activities or during certain time periods based on the dynamic interplay of issues and solutions considered by the processing entity.

*Carter* relates to reality shows which purportedly offer “multiple sources of financing—including foreign production companies and advertisers –to avoid the usual television industry structure” where “a studio pays a program’s costs, receives a fee from a network that defrays part of the cost and covers the rest as a deficit.” See *Carter* page 2, para. 2. Apparently, one example of *Carter* teaches providing “product placement” within the show. *Id.* at page 3, para. 2.

Nothing has been found in *Carter* that is believed to teach or suggest “a processing entity” or “interface” as recited in Claim 1. In stark contrast, *Carter*’s “product placement” is nothing more than that – placement of products or commercials in a broadcast. Applicants submit that such product placements techniques suggested by *Carter* are not integrated in a show having a storyline related to a business operation to determine a solution to an issue related to the business operation. Moreover, advertising/marketing

placement techniques of *Carter* fail to demonstrate providing input from an owner of a similar business operation.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is not anticipated by *Carter*, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything that, in Applicants' opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as applied against independent Claim 1 herein. Therefore, Claim 1 is respectfully submitted to be patentable over the art of record.

Applicants further submit that a combination of *Carter*, *Card Placement* and *Open*, assuming such respective combinations would even be permissible, would fail to teach or suggest the features discussed above with respect to Claim 1

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is patentable over the cited art, and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

The other rejected claims in this application depend from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and, therefore, are submitted to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Because each dependent claim also is deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

*/Jonathan Berschadsky/*

Jonathan Berschadsky

Attorney for Applicants

Registration No. 46,551

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCHS\_WS 1668660\_1.DOC